



University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Fawcett, B., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M.

Article Title: The Scale Properties of the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTSA) Among Canadian Baptist Youth

Year of publication: 2011

Link to published article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11089-010-0324-5>

Publisher statement: The original publication is available at www.springerlink.com

The Scale Properties of the Adolescent Form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTSA) Among Canadian Baptist Youth

Bruce G. Fawcett ¹

Leslie J. Francis²

Mandy Robbins³

Abstract A sample of 755 religiously committed young people between the ages of 12 and 18 attending Tidal Impact (a weeklong youth mission and service event sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada) completed a trial 80-item form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales designed for use among adolescents. These data were employed to refine four ten-item forced-choice scales to distinguish between preferences for the two orientations (extraversion and introversion), the two perceiving processes (sensing and intuition), the two judging processes (thinking and feeling) and the two attitudes (judging and perceiving). The scale properties of the new instrument commend the 40-item Adolescent form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTSA) for future use.

Key words Psychological type, assessment, Francis Psychological Type Scales, religion, youth, Canada.

¹ Bruce G. Fawcett (Contact)
Academic Dean, Director of Doctoral Studies,
Associate Professor of Leadership
Acadia Divinity College
Acadia University
31 Horton Avenue
Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Canada
B4P 2R6
Telephone (902) 585-2210
Fax (902) 585-2233
E-mail bruce.fawcett@acadiau.ca

² Leslie J Francis
University of Warwick, UK

³ Mandy Robbins
University of Warwick, UK

Introduction

The notion of psychological type, as developed initially by Jung (1971) in his classic study *Psychological Types* and as modified and extended by studies like *Gifts Differing* (Myers & Myers, 1980) has provided an attractive model for studying individual differences within the fields of practical, pastoral, and empirical theology. The notion of psychological type has been employed to illuminate, for example, theological reflection on areas like prayer (Duncan, 1993), ministry and leadership (Oswald & Kroeger, 1988), congregations (Baab, 1998), evangelism (Butler, 1999), and preaching (Francis & Village, 2008). Through the development of well-calibrated psychometric instruments designed to operationalize psychological type theory, theological reflection informed by such theory can be properly subjected to empirical investigation.

As currently presented, psychological type theory distinguishes between two different expressions of four key aspects of the human psyche. Functioning as a typology these pairs of expressions are clearly differentiated as opposing preferences. Although individuals are regarded as capable of employing both expressions of the psyche associated with each of the four key aspects, it is maintained that one aspect will always be preferred (and consequently developed) over the other. While the language used to describe these four aspects of psychological type theory remains somewhat fluid in the wider literature, Francis (2005) argues that there are advantages in agreeing on the following nomenclature: the two orientations, the two perceiving processes, the two judging processes, and the two attitudes toward the outer world.

The orientations are concerned with the ways in which people gather psychological energy. Extraverts (E) draw their energy from the outer world of events, people, and things, and focus their attention on that outer world. Introverts (I) draw their energy from the inner world of thoughts and reflections, and focus their attention on that inner world.

The perceiving processes are concerned with the ways in which people receive information. Sensing types (S) focus on perceptions received through the five senses, and are concerned with facts, details, and practical realities in the here and now. Intuitive types (N) focus on perceptions received through intuition, and are concerned with inspirations, meanings, and possibilities for the future.

The judging processes are concerned with the ways in which people make decisions and judgements. Thinking types (T) make judgments based on objective, impersonal logic,

and tend to value truthfulness and fairness. Feeling types (F) make judgments based on subjective, personal values, and tend to value harmony and compassion.

The attitudes toward the outer world are concerned with which process (Judging T/F or Perceiving S/N) is preferred for dealing with the outside world. Judging types (J) are orderly, decisive, and organised, as they judge stimuli from the outer world in order to reach conclusions and make decisions swiftly. Perceiving types (P) are open, spontaneous, and flexible, as they perceive stimuli from the outer world in order to continue gathering information as long as possible before reaching conclusions and making decisions.

These four dichotomous indices combine to produce 16 discrete psychological types from which it is possible to define an individual's dominant and auxiliary functions and whether these functions are introverted or extraverted. The dominant function is the function that is most preferred and the auxiliary function is the second preferred function, which may be consciously used when the dominant function is insufficient or inappropriate. Each of the perceiving processes (sensing and intuition) and each of the judging processes (thinking and feeling) can be extraverted (used in the outer world) or introverted (used in the inner world). Whichever of the two perceiving processes is extraverted, the other is introverted. Likewise, whichever of the two judging processes is extraverted, the other is introverted. Judging types extravert their judging function (that is, thinking or feeling) and perceiving types extravert their perceiving function (that is, sensing or intuition). Introverts employ their dominant function in their inner world and use their auxiliary function in the outer world. In contrast, extraverts employ their dominant function in their outer world and use their auxiliary function in their inner world.

Psychological type theory has been operationalized by a number of instruments designed for use among adults. These type indicators include the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey (Gray & Wheelwright, 1946), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), the Singer-Loomis Inventory of Personality (Loomis, 1982), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Personal Style Inventory (Ware, Yokomoto, & Morris, 1985), the Type Differentiation Indicator (Mitchell, 1991), the Cambridge Type Inventory (Rawling, 1992), the PET Check (Cranton & Knoop, 1995), the Jung Type Indicator (Budd, 1997), the Personal Preferences Self-description Questionnaire (Kier, Malancon, & Thompson, 1998), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). The three instruments that have been used most frequently within the context of empirical theology and the psychology of religion are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, and the Francis Psychological Type Scales.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been used, for example, in studies among church congregations (Ross, 1993, 1995; Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004), adult churchgoers (Francis & Jones, 1998, 1999, 2000; Francis, Butler, Jones, & Craig, 2007), Anglican clergy (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), Bible College students (Francis, Penson, & Jones, 2001; Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008; Kay & Francis, 2008), students studying religion (Francis, Jones, & Craig, 2004), evangelical missionary personnel (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), evangelical lay church leaders (Francis, Craig, Horsfall, & Ross, 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), Christian youthworkers (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007), and seminarians (Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007).

The Keirsey Temperament Sorter has been used, for example, in studies among churchgoers (Jones & Francis, 1999; Francis & Louden, 2000), church congregations (Village & Francis, 2005; Village 2005), students studying religion (Fearn, Francis, & Wilcox 2001), and Anglican clergy (Francis & Robbins 2008).

The Francis Psychological Type Scales have been used, for example, in studies among Evangelical church leaders (Francis & Robbins, 2002; Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004), students studying religion (Francis, Robbins, Boxer, Lewis, McGuckin, & McDaid, 2003), church congregations (Craig, Francis, Bailey, & Robbins, 2003; Craig 2005; Francis, Robbins, Williams, & Williams, 2007; Francis, Craig, & Hall, 2008), members of a student Christian Union (Craig, Bigio, Robbins, & Francis, 2005), visitors staying at a Benedictine retreat center (Francis, Village, Robbins, & Ineson, 2007), and cathedral visitors (Francis, Williams, Annis, & Robbins, 2008).

Although the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, and the Francis Psychological Type Scales are all designed to operationalize the same fundamental psychological constructs, each of these instruments has distinctive strengths appropriate for different applications. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was designed for administration and interpretation by specially trained and licensed practitioners and is especially helpful in one-on-one consultations. The Keirsey Temperament sorter was designed for self-completion and is especially helpful in exercises of self-examination. The Francis Psychological Type Scales were specifically designed for research purposes and are particularly useful in large-scale surveys in which participation is generally anonymous and the participants anticipate no individual feedback.

The measurement of psychological type is much less well established among children and adolescents. The main instrument available in the field is the Murphy-Meisgeier Type

Indicator for Children. The original form of this instrument, published in 1987, was designed for children in grades 2 through 8 (Meisgeier & Murphy, 1987). The revised form, published in 2008, extended the age range upwards to grade 12 (Murphy & Meisgeier, 2008). Apart from the two manuals (1987, 2008), there is very little published research literature on this instrument.

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to build on the success of the Francis Psychological Type Scales as a research instrument and to test the development of a comparable instrument for use among adolescents.

Method

Procedure

The Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) propose four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). These items were discussed with a group of young people and expanded into four sets of 20 forced-choice items in light of the vocabulary understood and preferred by young people. This expanded set of 80 items was arranged for scoring in conventional forced-choiced questionnaire format. These items were preceded with the following instructions: “The following list contains pairs of characteristics. For each pair check the box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if other people see you differently. Please complete every question.”

Sample

The survey was completed by 755 adolescents between the ages of 12 and 18 years who attended Tidal Impact 2002 held in New Brunswick, Canada. Tidal Impact is a weeklong mission and service program sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches for youth groups from member churches. The event is normally held during alternating summers in Eastern Canada. Of the total respondents, 35% indicated that they were males and 65% indicated that they were female.

Analysis

The data were analyzed by means of the SPSS statistical package.

Results

The first step in data analysis employed correlation, factor and reliability analyses in order to select the ten best pairs of forced-choice items from the original pool of 20 items relevant to the orientations, the perceiving process, the judging process, and the attitudes toward the outside world. Tables 1,2,3 and 4 present the end results of these analyses. All four scales generated alpha coefficients of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach, 1951) in excess of the acceptable threshold of .65 proposed by DeVellis (2003).

- insert tables 1,2,3 and 4 about here -

According to Table 1, the ten qualities defining extraversion among adolescents (ranked from the highest item rest-of-test correlations to the lowest) were: talkative, people get to know you quickly, an open person, an extravert, easy to get to know, easy to talk to new people, like to talk, being with other brings you to life, like parties, and prefer to do things with the crowd. The ten qualities defining introversion (ranked by the same criterion) were: quiet, people get to know you slowly, a private person, an introvert, difficult to get to know, hard to talk to new people, like to listen, being with too many people tires you, dislike parties, and prefer to do things on your own.

According to Table 2 the ten qualities defining sensing among adolescents (ranked from highest item rest-of-test correlation to the lowest) were: practical, prefer tried and trusted paths, matter of fact, like to stick with familiar things, down to earth, like to keep things as they are, like to do one thing at a time, a realist, trust experience, and you see things as they are. The ten qualities defining intuition (ranked by the same criterion) were: inventive, prefer new and novel ways, imaginative, like to try new things, up in the air, like to change things, like to do many things at once, a dreamer, trust inspiration, you see things as they might be.

According to Table 3 the ten qualities defining thinking among adolescents (ranked from highest item rest-of-test correlation to the lowest) were: fair minded, prefer to be firm, find it hard to be sympathetic, care about others' rights, test people, tend to be sceptical, hard, tend to correct others, prefer debate, and prefer thinking. The ten qualities defining feeling (ranked by the same criterion) were: warm hearted, prefer to be kind, find it easy to be sympathetic, care about others' feelings, trust people, tend to be trusting, sensitive, tend to encourage others, prefer agreement, and prefer feeling.

According to Table 4 the ten qualities defining a judging attitude toward the outer world among adolescents (ranked from highest item rest-of-test correlation to the lowest) were: having your time organized is good, find working to timetables helpful, like to be well-

prepared, organized, take deadlines seriously, find making lists helpful, happy with routine, prefer things to be structured, prefer to act on decisions, and you do your best work in advance. The ten qualities defining a perceiving attitude toward the outer world (ranked by the same criterion) were: having your time organized is annoying, find working to time tables irritating, find being too prepared unhelpful, disorganized, feel relaxed about deadlines, find making lists a waste of time, unhappy with routine, prefer things to be open-ended, prefer to act on impulse, and you do your best work at the last minute.

The second step in data analysis employed the continuous scale scores recorded on the eight scales to assign each individual to discrete psychological types: either introvert or extravert; either sensing or intuitive; either thinking or feeling; either judging or perceiving. Following the precedent established by the Francis Psychological Type Scales, scores on the opposing continuous scales were weighted in favour of introversion, intuition, feeling, and perceiving. Using this scoring mechanism 51% of the sample were classified as extraverts and 49% as introverts; 31% were classified as sensors and 69% as intuitives; 10% were classified as thinkers and 90% as feelers; and 53% as judges and 47% as perceivers. These findings are generally consistent with what is known about leaders across a broad spectrum of Christian denominations where there are particularly strong preferences for intuition over sensing and for feeling over thinking (see for example Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007).

Conclusion

The present study set out to develop groups of forced-choice items that would render the principles operationalized by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) accessible to adolescents within the age range of 12 to 18 years. Data drawn for a group of 755 religiously committed young people attending the Tidal Impact youth mission and service event sponsored by the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches in Eastern Canada have generated four sets of ten items each designed to distinguish between preferences for extraversion and introversion (the orientations), between preferences for sensing and intuition (the perceiving process), between preference for thinking and feeling (the judging process), and between preferences over judging and perceiving (the attitude toward to outer world).

Internal consistency reliability for the four sets of items has been supported by alpha coefficients in excess of the threshold of 0.65 proposed by DeVellis (2003). Face validity has been supported by the way in which the ten qualities associated with each of the eight constructs map onto the theoretical constructs being operationalized by the measures.

Construct validity has been supported by the way in which the type profile recorded by the religiously committed group of adolescents broadly reflects what is known from other research about the type profile of church leaders, especially in terms of the strong preferences for feeling over thinking and for judging over perceiving. On this basis the adolescent form of the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTSA) can be commended for further use.

The present study is nonetheless limited in important ways that need to be addressed by future research. The present study was limited to religiously committed Baptist youth. Future research needs to complement this sample by concentrating on other religious groups and on non-religious groups of young people. The present study was limited to exploring internal consistency reliability. Future research needs to complement this approach by exploring test-retest reliability which is capable of examining the reliability not only of the continuous scale scores but also of the assignment to discrete type categories. The present study was limited to exploring only one aspect of construct validity, in terms of similarity of type profile with what is known from other studies concerned with religious leaders. Future research needs to complement this approach by examining how data recorded on this instrument functions in relation to other theoretical formulations regarding the correlates of type preferences.

References

- Baab, L. M. (1998). *Personality type in congregations: How to work with others more effectively*. Washington, DC: Alban Institute.
- Budd, R.J. (1997). *Manual for Jung Type Indicator*. Bedford: Psytech International.
- Butler, A. (1999). *Personality and Communicating the Gospel*. Cambridge: Grove Books.
- Craig, C.L. (2005). Psychological type preferences of rural churchgoers. *Rural Theology*, 3, 123-131.
- Craig, C., Bigio, J., Robbins, M., & Francis, L.J. (2005). Psychological types of student members of a Christian Union in Wales. *The Psychologist in Wales*, 18, 11-15.
- Craig, C.L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 27, 157-164.

- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales*, 15, 18-21.
- Craig, C., Francis, L.J. & Robbins, M. (2004). Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 25, 3-13.
- Craig, C. L. Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England: a role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology*, 53, 475-482.
- Cranton, P., & Knoop, R. (1995). Assessing Jung's psychological types: The PET Type Check. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 121, 249-274.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests, *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London, Sage.
- Duncan, B. (1993). *Pray your way: Your personality and God*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Fearn, M., Francis, L. J., & Wilcox, C. (2001). Attitude toward Christianity and psychological type: a survey among religious studies students. *Pastoral Psychology*, 49, 341-348.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- L.J. Francis, L.J., Butler, A., Jones, S.H., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican Church: a perspective from England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 10, 435-443.
- Francis, L.J., Craig, C.L., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male evangelical

Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 67, 11-17.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Christianity*, 23, 181-191.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion*, 1, 69-83.

Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.

Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1, 66-77.

Francis, L.J., & Jones, S.H. (1998). Personality and Christian belief among adult churchgoers. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 47, 5-11.

Francis, L.J., & Jones, S.H. (1999). The scale properties of the MBTI Form G (Anglicised) among adult churchgoers. *Pastoral Sciences*, 18, 107-126.

Francis, L.J., & Jones, S.H. (2000). The relationship between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire among adult churchgoers. *Pastoral Theology*, 48, 377-386.

Francis, L.J., Jones, S.H., & Craig, C.L. (2004). Personality and religion: the relationship between psychological type and attitude toward Christianity. *Archiv Für Religionspsychologie*, 26, 15-33.

- Francis, L.J., & Loudon, S.H. (2000). Mystical orientation and psychological type: a study among student and adult churchgoers. *Transpersonal Psychology Review*, 4 (1), 36-42.
- Francis, L.J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry: psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom, *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5(2), 73-90.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.
- Francis, L. J., Penson, A. W., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male and female Bible College students in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 4, 23-32.
- Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders. *Journal of Belief and Values*, 23, 217-220.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2008). Psychological type and prayer preferences: A study among Anglican clergy in the United Kingdom. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 11, 67-84.
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., Boxer, A., Lewis, C.A., McGuckin, C., & McDaid, C.J. (2003). Psychological type and attitude toward Christianity: A replication. *Psychological Reports*, 92, 89-90.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales. *Rural Theology*, 5, 23-30.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. London: Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., Village, A., Robbins, M., & Ineson, K. (2007). Mystical orientation and psychological type: An empirical study among guests staying at a Benedictine Abbey. *Studies in Spirituality*, 17, 207-223.

- Francis, L.J., Williams, E., Annis, J., & Robbins, M. (2008). Understanding Cathedral visitors: Psychological type and individual differences in experience and appreciation. *Tourism Analysis, 13*, 71-80.
- Gray, H., & Wheelwright, J.B. (1946). Jung's psychological types, their frequency of occurrence. *Journal of General Psychology, 34*, 3-17.
- Jones, S.H., & Francis, L.J. (1999). Personality type and attitude toward Christianity among student churchgoers. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 20*, 105-109.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay, W. K., & Francis, L. J. (2008). Psychological type preferences of female Bible College students in England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 29*, 101-105.
- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2008). Psychological type preferences of male British Assemblies of God Bible College students: Tough minded or tender hearted? *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association, 28*, 6-20.
- Kier, F.J. Melancon, J.G., & Thompson, B. (1998). Reliability and validity of scores on the Personal Preferences Self-Description Questionnaire (PPSDQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 58*(4), 612-622.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Loomis, M. (1982). A new perspective for Jung's typology: The Singer-Loomis Inventory of Personality. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 27*, 59-69.
- Meisgeier, C., & Murphy, E. (1987). *Murphy-Meisgeier Type Indicator for Children: Manual*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Mitchell, W.D. (1991). A test of type theory using the TDI. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 22, 15-26.
- Murphy, E., & Meisgeier, C. (2008). *MMTIC Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Murphy-Meisgeier Type Indicator for Children*. Gainesville, Florida: Centre for Applications of Psychological Type.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I.B., & Myers, P.B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Oswald, R.M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.
- Rawling, K. (1992). *Preliminary manual: The Cambridge Type Indicator: Research edition*. Cambridge: Rawling Associates.
- Ross, C.F.J. (1993). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: Comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals and clergy. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 26, 28-35.
- Ross, C.F.J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: Four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 33, 33-41.
- Village, A. (2005). Christian belief about the Bible and the Holy Spirit in relation to psychological type. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 16, 1-16.
- Village, A., & Francis, L.J. (2005). The relationship of psychological type preferences to biblical interpretation. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 18(1), 74-89.

Ware, R., Yokomoto, C., & Morris, B.B. (1985). A preliminary study to assess validity of the Personal Style Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 56, 903-910.

Table 1 Orientation: item rest-of-test correlations and percentage endorsements

Item	r	agree %
<i>Extraversion</i>		
Talkative	.59	64
An extravert	.52	65
An open person	.54	58
Easy to get to know	.51	82
Like parties	.43	76
Like to talk	.48	57
Being with others brings you to life	.47	77
Prefer to do things with the crowd	.40	57
Easy to talk to new people	.49	60
People get to know you quickly	.56	65
<i>Introversion</i>		
Quiet	.59	36
An introvert	.52	35
A private person	.54	42
Difficult to get to know	.51	19
Dislike parties	.43	24
Like to listen	.48	43
Being with too many people tires you	.47	24
Prefer to do things on your own	.40	43
Hard to talk to new people	.49	41
People get to know you slowly	.56	35
Alpha = 0.82		

Table 2 Perceiving process: item rest-of-test correlations and percentage endorsements

Item	r	agree %
<i>Sensing</i>		
Practical	.41	55
Prefer tried and trusted paths	.40	50
Like to keep things as they are	.30	44
A Realist	.28	43
Down to earth	.31	78
Matter of fact	.40	37
You see things as they are	.27	51
Like to stick with familiar things	.37	38
Like to do one thing at a time	.30	56
Trust experience	.28	73
<i>Intuition</i>		
Inventive	.41	45
Prefer new and novel way	.40	50
Like to change things	.30	56
A dreamer	.28	57
Up in the air	.31	22
Imaginative	.40	63
You see things as they might be	.27	49
Like to try new things	.37	62
Like to do many things at once	.30	44
Trust inspiration	.28	27
Alpha = 0.67		

Table 3 Judging process: item rest-of-test correlations and percentage endorsements

Item	r	agree %
<i>Thinking</i>		
Prefer thinking	.21	48
Tend to correct others	.33	25
Tend to be sceptical	.36	23
Hard	.35	16
Fair minded	.50	20
Test people	.37	27
Care about others' rights	.39	14
Prefer to be firm	.40	15
Prefer debate	.27	33
Find it hard to be sympathetic	.40	19
Prefer feeling	.21	52
Tend to encourage others	.33	75
Tend to be trusting	.36	77
Sensitive	.35	84
Warm hearted	.50	80
Trust people	.37	73
Care about others' feelings	.39	86
Prefer to be kind	.40	85
Prefer agreement	.27	68
Find it easy to be sympathetic	.40	81
Alpha = 0.69		

Table 4 Attitude toward the outside world: item rest-of-test correlations and percentage endorsements

Item	r	agree %
<i>Judging</i>		
Organized	.49	63
Take deadlines seriously	.46	61
Find working to timetables helpful	.52	65
Happy with routine	.43	73
You do your best work in advance	.38	60
Prefer things to be structured	.43	59
Prefer to act on decisions	.40	63
Find making lists helpful	.44	68
Like to be well prepared	.50	82
Having your time organized is good	.54	71
<i>Perceiving</i>		
Disorganized	.49	37
Feel relaxed about deadlines	.46	39
Find working to timetables irritating	.52	35
Unhappy with routine	.43	27
You do your best work at the last minute	.38	40
Prefer things to be open-ended	.43	41
Prefer to act on impulse	.40	37
Find making lists a waste of time	.44	32
Find being too organized unhelpful	.50	18
Having your time organized is annoying	.54	29
Alpha = 0.79		

The following list contains pairs of words. For each pair check (✓) **ONE** box next to the words that are **closer** to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Check the words that reflects the real you, even if other people see you differently.

PLEASE COMPLETE EVERY QUESTION

Do you tend to be more...

talkative ☐ **or** ☐ quiet

Do you tend to be more...

practical ☐ **or** ☐ inventive

Do you prefer...

feeling ☐ **or** ☐ thinking

Are you...

organised ☐ **or** ☐ disorganised

Are you...

an extravert ☐ **or** ☐ an introvert

Do you prefer...

tried and trusted paths ☐ **or** ☐ new and novel ways

Do you tend to...

encourage others ☐ **or** ☐ correct others

Do you...

take deadlines seriously ☐ **or** ☐ feel relaxed about deadlines

Are you more...

an open person ☐ **or** ☐ private person

Are you...

a realist ☐ **or** ☐ a dreamer

Do you tend to be...

trusting ☐ **or** ☐ sceptical

Do you find working ...

to timetables helpful ☐ **or** ☐ to timetables irritating

Are you...

easy to get to know ☐ **or** ☐ difficult to get to know

Do you like to...

keep things as they are ☐ **or** ☐ change things

Are you...

sensitive ☐ **or** ☐ hard

Are you...

happy with routine ☐ **or** ☐ unhappy with routine

- Do you like to...**
talk ☐ **or** ☐ listen
- Are you...**
down to earth ☐ **or** ☐ up in the air
- Are you...**
warm-hearted ☐ **or** ☐ fair-minded
- Do you do your best work...**
in advance ☐ **or** ☐ at the last minute
- Do you find that being with...**
others brings you to life ☐ **or** ☐ too many people tires you
- Do you tend to be more...**
matter of fact ☐ **or** ☐ imaginative
- Do you...**
trust people ☐ **or** ☐ test people
- Do you prefer things to be...**
structured ☐ **or** ☐ open-ended
- Do you...**
like parties ☐ **or** ☐ dislike parties
- Do you see things...**
as they are ☐ **or** ☐ as they might be
- Do you care about...**
others' feelings ☐ **or** ☐ others' rights
- Do you prefer to act ...**
on decisions ☐ **or** ☐ on impulse
- Do you prefer to do things...**
with the crowd ☐ **or** ☐ on your own
- Do you like to...**
stick with familiar things ☐ **or** ☐ try new things
- Do you prefer...**
agreement ☐ **or** ☐ debate
- Do you find making lists...**
helpful ☐ **or** ☐ a waste of time
- Do you find it...**
easy to talk to new people ☐ **or** ☐ hard to talk to new people
- Do you like to do...**
one thing at a time ☐ **or** ☐ many things at once
- Do you prefer to be...**
kind ☐ **or** ☐ firm
- Do you...**
like to be well prepared ☐ **or** ☐ find being too prepared unhelpful

Do you feel that people...

get to know you quickly

☐

or

☐

get to know you slowly

Do you trust...

experience

☐

or

☐

inspiration

Do you find it...

easy to be sympathetic

☐

or

☐

hard to be sympathetic

Do you feel that having your...

time organised is good

☐

or

☐

time organised is annoying